Combined Perspective

Joint DoD / Industry MRL Workshop

May 14, 2008

Positive observations

- MRAs are key to affordability
- Requires Manufacturing personnel involved in AoA or TDS Process.
- The Matrix is very clear on how to integrate manufacturing readiness into the existing system processes and progress to a MRL 10.
- Like MRAs as a part of the Source Selection Process.
- Necessary elevation of manufacturing maturity and risk.
- MRLs and MRAs are obviously filling a need in S&T/ Acquisition.
- Process incorporates early assessment.
- Well structured framework, common definitions and language, and enhanced communication, with clear connectivity with TRLs and the Acquisition community.
- Cost of performing MRAs was not considered to be significant.
  - If program is prepared well.
- Air Force / Industry moving ahead quickly
- Collaborative involvement between & industry leading to improved capability
- Value of performing MRA has demonstrated positive results,Excellent benchmark system.

Needed Improvements

- Deskbook: Develop and insert **examples** to help guide interpretation of levels, Assessment, MRA reporting, and followup.
- “initial MRA will be conducted for MS A” and this does not match mandatory requirement for TRAs, need to clarify expectations for early MRA activities.
- Deskbook is missing how to identify what products/processes needs an MRA, e.g. mirror TRA process.
- Proposed Policy letter only requires pilot projects only, there are no follow-up requirements.
- Don’t lock in S&T and Acquisition Programs for a specified MRL (no appeals process). Need remediation process, but preserve teeth.
- Matrix has criteria descriptions for 1&2 that are not available (or sometime possible) at the early stages.
- Independent Review Process is not explained well.
- Provide an “appeal’s” process when the contractors and/or customer can’t agree with the rating
- Ensure consistency of MRA Processes among assessments.
- Need to have specific name for the specific areas where MRA reviews (CME?)
- MRA Resource Requirements: Cost scaling: Contractor and government resources to implement

Process Oriented Comments

- Early definitions:
  - MRL levels 1 & 2 are difficult to differentiate and add little value.
  - Use levels to encourage collaboration with tech /manf. Personnel, without stifling innovation.
- Leverage mandatory MRA process and reporting with existing TRA process.
  - But requires equal weight and priority.
  - Use DDR&E as process owner.
- MRAs are not a one-time event
  - Key success factor will be the requirement to perform an initial assessment near MS A to capture baseline and construct a plan to get MRLs to level 6 at MS B. (TDS)
- Key issue: Resources required to implement policy memo on existing programs (new programs can write in contract language).
- Refine criteria for defining MRA scope - determining what manufacturing processes address
- Define depth of MRA assessment process
- Reconcile the terminology between the TRA and MRA processes
- Define Manufacturing Subject matter expert in the deskbook, it should define general skills and domain specific skills.
- Include SBIR Topics which are sponsored by Acquisition programs.

Policy Recommendations

- Ownership / reporting process: DDR&E (Aligns with TRA)
- Need to address Manufacturing Readiness at /near MS A, and link with TDS / SEP.
- Policy needs to include MMP for ensuring that Manufacturability is built into the program.
  - Give MS Decision authority Latitude to remediate
- Policy should not be watered down during coordination process.
- Need to expand beyond pilot programs, and provide a phases implementation approach for legacy programs.

Areas of Non-Consensus

- Required MRL at MS B:
  - Army- Couple MRL 4 with TRL 6 to allow programs to meet MS B
  - Others: Important to be at MRL 6.
- MRA reported at:
  - PDR / CDR / PRR versus MS B, MS C, FRD
  - Determined that being aligned with TRA process is higher priority.